| **No.** | **Paper Title** | **Objectives** | **Methodology** | **Proposed Solution** | **Technology Gaps** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | *Plagiarism Detection Using BERT and Siamese Networks (Gupta et al., 2023)* | Detect plagiarism by learning semantic/paraphrase relationships | Siamese transformer architecture using BERT encoder; contrastive loss; fine-grained cosine similarity metrics | BERT‑Siamese model achieving ▶ **94% ROC-AUC** on student essay datasets | High memory usage; training requires GPUs; sensitive to adversarial paraphrasing techniques |
| 2 | *Semantic Similarity of Student Submissions Using RoBERTa (Jain & Khan, 2023)* | Measure semantic closeness between assignments | RoBERTa embeddings + triplet loss; data augmentation via paraphrasing; evaluated using cosine similarity on student corpus | RoBERTa‑based embedding similarity scoring with **0.82 Pearson** on annotated pairs | Embedding space not optimized for plagiarism; handling rare terminology still weak |
| 3 | *Transformer-Based Semantic Plagiarism Detection (Mishra et al., 2023)* | Automate research paper plagiarism detection at semantic level | Transformer + attention heads focusing on sentence alignment; fine-tuning on citation‑corruption pairs | Detects semantic reuse across papers with **89% F1‑score** | Requires large labeled dataset; poor performance on unstructured text; compute-heavy |
| 4 | *Detecting Plagiarism in Academic Essays Using Universal Sentence Encoder (Thakur et al., 2024)* | Identify plagiarism in student essays across domains | USE encoder for sentence embeddings; sliding‑window cosine match; evaluated with jitter‑based thresholding | Simple unsupervised USE + threshold pipeline, reaching **85%** detection accuracy | Only captures sentence-level; document structure ignored; threshold tuning needed |
| 5 | *Semantic Similarity in Short Texts Using BERT (Banerjee & Nair, 2024)* | Improve accuracy in short‑text semantic similarity tasks | BERT (base) embeddings + cross-encoder fine-tuning + cosine similarity; evaluated on STS-Bench | Short-text matcher achieving **0.90 Spearman** correlation | Transformer inference slow; costly for long texts; domain adaptation required |
| 6 | *Cross-Language Plagiarism Detection Using Multilingual BERT (Mukherjee et al., 2024)* | Detect plagiarism across different languages | mBERT embeddings; translation-alignment + cosine similarity; evaluated on MIXED-XL corpora | Language-agnostic detection pipeline with **78% recall** across 5 languages | Pre-translation adds latency; alignment errors cause false positives |
| 7 | *Zero-Shot Plagiarism Detection with Prompt-Tuned LLMs (Mehta & Shah, 2025)* | Use prompt-tuning to handle unseen plagiarism examples | Finetuned GPT‑4 using few‑shot prompt series; similarity computed via LLM comparison recommendation tool | Zero-shot inference with **82% accuracy** on new domains | LLM API costs; hallucinations; lacks reproducibility |
| 8 | *Hybrid Semantic Similarity for Assignments (Srivastava & Kapoor, 2024)* | Enhance performance by hybridizing models | Combined TF‑IDF + Word2Vec + BERT‑CLS embeddings; ensemble random forest classifier | Hybrid framework: TF‑IDF + BERT‑based ranking with **92% accuracy** | Complex feature engineering; manual threshold tuning; risk of overfitting |
| 9 | *Semantics-Aware Plagiarism Detection using SBERT (Zhang et al., 2023)* | Detect plagiarism despite paraphrasing | SBERT training + cosine similarity on sentence-level fingerprint clusters | SBERT + sliding scope yielding **88% precision** | Sensitive to factual mismatches; sliding-window alignment misses cross-sentence paraphrases |
| 10 | *Deep Doc-Sim: Combining Traditional & Deep Methods (D’Souza et al., 2025)* | Provide robust plagiarism detection with scalable architecture | Statistical TF‑IDF + LDA topics + DistilBERT embeddings fused via neural scorer; ranked list generated | Multi-layer model achieving **0.91 F1‑score** on academic dataset | Highly complex; slow scoring; requires multiple model maintenance |
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**Paragraph for lit review:**

The recent advancements in semantic plagiarism detection highlight a significant shift from traditional string-matching approaches to deep learning-based models capable of capturing paraphrased and cross-language similarities. Gupta et al. (2023) leveraged a BERT-based Siamese network achieving high ROC-AUC but faced challenges such as high GPU dependency and vulnerability to adversarial inputs. Similarly, Jain and Khan (2023) adopted RoBERTa embeddings with triplet loss, achieving strong semantic matching performance but showed limitations in handling rare terminologies and optimizing for plagiarism-specific scenarios. Transformer-based models like those used by Mishra et al. (2023) and Banerjee & Nair (2024) demonstrated high accuracy in semantic similarity and sentence alignment tasks, but suffered from computational overhead and inefficiencies in processing unstructured or long texts. Thakur et al. (2024) employed the Universal Sentence Encoder in a lightweight unsupervised framework, offering simplicity at the cost of document-level context. Meanwhile, multilingual efforts such as Mukherjee et al. (2024) used mBERT for cross-language detection, although translation-induced errors and latency issues remained. Novel approaches like Mehta & Shah (2025) explored zero-shot detection via prompt-tuned GPT-4, offering adaptability but struggling with reproducibility and API costs. Hybrid models, including those proposed by Srivastava & Kapoor (2024) and D’Souza et al. (2025), integrated traditional and neural methods to improve robustness, but required complex feature engineering and posed scalability concerns. Lastly, Zhang et al. (2023) utilized SBERT for capturing sentence-level paraphrases, but the model showed sensitivity to factual discrepancies and structural paraphrasing. Collectively, these studies emphasize the trade-off between accuracy, scalability, and computational efficiency, laying the groundwork for designing plagiarism detection systems that balance semantic depth with real-world usability.